Armed Forces Retirement Home Categorical Exclusion Checklist

Project Name: AFRH Eagle Gate Project

Project Location: Eagle Gate - Main Campus Entrance

Project Description: (Describe what you are going to do and relate it to the documented categorical exclusion you are selecting below.)

AFRH plans improvements to the entrance at Eagle Gate. This project was included in the AFRH-W Master Plan (2008) and has the following goals:

- Enhance and update campus security: AFRH must update their campus security to comply with Homeland Security Presidential Directive 12, which requires specific security system enhancements to all federally controlled facilities. These enhancements will include security cameras, CAC card access, and vehicular and pedestrian traffic control devices.
- Improve traffic flow through Eagle Gate by providing separate lanes for guests and cars with passes: Currently, traffic during the peak morning traffic hours causes a back-up of vehicles into the intersection of Rock Creek Church Road and Upshur Street. Two entrance lanes will allow employees and contractors to move through the gate with their CAC cards without waiting for visitors to go through security.
- Improve pedestrian entrance and exit: Currently, there is only one sidewalk on the south side of the entrance. There is no sidewalk on the north side of the entrance. Therefore, pedestrians must cross the road in a high-traffic area to access the facilities on the north side of the campus. This condition is particularly a problem in the peak traffic hours in the evening as charter school students and visitors to the President Lincoln's Cottage National Monument must cross Lincoln Drive to exit the campus.
- Resolve safety issues for security guards: Currently, security guards must cross traffic lanes to assist visitors who are exiting the campus or to access the driver's side of cars entering the campus.
- Improve appearance of entrance while protecting adjacent historic resources (Eagle Gate and Eagle Gate House).

To achieve these project goals, the following scope is proposed:

Replace the existing Eagle Gate Guard House (Building 25). The Eagle Gate
Guard House was constructed in 1983 and is a non-contributing resource to the
AFRH-W Historic District. The existing guard house will be removed, and a new
guard house will be located on Lincoln Drive, between the entrance and exit
lanes. In response to feedback provided by NCPC and CFA, the new guard

September 1, 2010 Page 1 of 6

house is a simple, pre-fabricated one-story metal shelter that is oriented east-towest to minimize the effects on views into the campus.

- Reconfiguration of entrance and exit lanes of Lincoln Drive This section of Lincoln Drive was previously altered, most recently during the 1980s, and the current material, width, and lane configuration do not reflect the original or historic condition of the resource. The existing three traffic lanes will be reconfigured and widened to accommodate the new location for the guard house and to provide two entrance lanes to the south of the guard house and one exit lane to the north of the guard house. The total number of lanes will not change. A planted median will extend east and west from the guard house to provide a buffer between the exit and entrance lanes and to protect the guard house. To minimize the amount of striping on the pavement, pavers will be selectively used to delineate crosswalks and points of access. Each lane provided for vehicular traffic will have a CAC reader and a traffic control arm.
- Construction of a new sidewalk and addition of pedestrian traffic control devices. A new sidewalk will be constructed on the north side of the entrance to provide direct access from the street to the Visitors Center for the President Lincoln's Cottage. A sally port will be installed along both the north and south sidewalks to provide secure entrance and exist points for pedestrians.
- Protect the intact historic resources at the entrance.
 - No work is proposed for the Eagle Gate House (Building 9) or the historic sections of Eagle Gate, both of which will be protected during construction.
- Relocation of the interior (campus-side) sections iron fence to accommodate a new lane configuration. Sections of a small iron fence will be moved to the north and south. According to historic photographs, these sections of fence are not original to Eagle Gate and were most likely installed during the 1980s renovations of the entrance.
- Partial replacement of the Eagle Gate Plantings to accommodate the reconfiguration of the traffic lanes. Areas of flowers and shrubs planted along the iron entry fence will be removed. No existing trees will be removed. All new plantings will be consistent in form and function with the removed plantings.

This project, the modification of the Eagle Gate entrance, was included as part of the approved AFRH Master Plan of August 2008. No increase in traffic is expected at the entrance, and the reconfiguration will reduce queuing time outside the gate. The scale of construction will be similar to the scale that is currently present at the entrance. In addition, in accordance with its process per the 2008 Programmatic Agreement, AFRH

September 1, 2010

has completed an Undertaking Review Request (URR), which has been concurred on by the DC SHPO, who agrees with AFRH's finding of no adverse impact.			
Section A.4 of the AFRH NEPA Regulations states that "the following are categorical exclusions that require preparation of a checklist to ensure that no extraordinary circumstances exist that would require preparation of an EA or EIS. The action above qualifies as a documented categorical exclusion (<i>check applicable CATEX letter and description</i>).			
(a) Expansion or improvement of an existing facility where all of the following conditions are met:			
 The structure and proposed use are substantially in compliance with local planning and zoning and any applicable state or Federal requirements; The proposed use will only slightly increase the number of motor vehicles at the facility; The site and the scale of construction are consistent with those of existing adjacent or nearby buildings; and There is no evidence of environmental controversy. 			
(b) Transfer or disposal of real property to state or local agencies for preservation or protection of wildlife conservation and historic monument purposes.			
(c) Disposal of fixtures, related personal property, demountable structures, transmission lines, utility poles, railroad ties, and track in accordance with management requirements.			
(d) Disposal of properties where the size, area, topography, and zoning are similar to existing surrounding properties and/or where current and reasonable anticipated uses are or would be similar to current surrounding uses (e.g., commercial store in a commercial strip, warehouse in an urban complex, office building in downtown area, row house or vacant lot in an urban area).			
(e) Demolition, removal and disposal of debris from the demolition or improvement of buildings and other structures neither on nor eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places and when under applicable regulations (i.e., removal of asbestos, polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), and other hazardous material) when other environmental laws and regulations will be satisfied prior to the demolition, removal and disposal.			
(f) Relocations and realignments of employees and/or residents from one geographic area to another that: Fall below the thresholds for reportable actions and do not involve related activities such as construction, renovation, or demolition activities that would otherwise require an EA or an EIS to impellent.			

September 1, 2010 Page 3 of 6

This includes reorganization and reassignments with no changes in employee and/or resident status, and routine administrative reorganizations and consolidations.

an EA	Isure that no extraordinary circumstances exist that would requing an EIS, answer the following questions in their entirety. If you are questions, there may be other environmental laws and reguled to comply and/or an EA or EIS may need to be prepared.	answer yes	s to one
1.	Is there reasonable likelihood of significant effects on public health, safety, or the environment?	Yes	⊠ No
2.	Is there reasonable likelihood of significant environmental effects (direct, indirect, and cumulative)?	☐ Yes	⊠ No
3.	Would the action cause an imposition of uncertain or unique environmental risks?	☐ Yes	⊠ No
4.	Would this action result in a greater scope or size than is normal for this category of action?	☐ Yes	⊠ No
5.	Have there been any reportable releases of hazardous or toxic substances as specified in 40 CFR part 302, Designation, Reportable Quantities, and Notification?	☐ Yes	⊠ No
6.	Have there been or will there be any releases of petroleum, oils, and lubricants, application of pesticides and herbicides, or would the proposed action result in the requirement to develop or amend a Spill Prevention, Control, or Countermeasures Plan?	Yes	⊠ No
7.	Would the action exceed de minimis levels for air emissions such that a formal Clean Air Act conformity determination would be required?	Yes	⊠ No
8.	Is there a reasonable likelihood that the action would violate any Federal, state, or local law or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment? Why or why not?	☐ Yes	⊠ No
9.	Would there be any unresolved effect on environmentally sensitive resources, as defined in the AFRH NEPA Regulations 4.b.(1)(c) ¹ ?	☐ Yes	⊠ No
10). Would the action cause an effect on the quality of the	□Yes	⊠ No

environment that is likely to be highly controversial?

11. Would the action involve an effect on the environme is highly uncertain, involve unique or unknown risks, scientifically controversial?		Yes	⊠ No
12. Does the action establish a precedent (or make dec principle) for future or subsequent actions that are reasonably likely to have a future significant effect?	isions in [Yes	⊠ No
13. Does the action have the potential for degradation of existing poor environmental conditions; or initiation of degrading influence, activity, or effect in areas not a significantly modified from their natural condition?	of a	Yes	⊠ No
14. Would the action introduce/employ unproven technology	ology? [Yes	⊠ No
15. Does the location involve environmentally sensitive resources as defined in the AFRH NEPA Regulation 4.b.(1)(c) 1?	-	⊠ Yes	☐ No
16. Would the proposed action affect Federally listed, threatened, or endangered species or their designat critical habitat?	ed [Yes	⊠ No
17. Would the proposed action affect properties listed of for listing on the National Register of Historic Places	· ·	⊠ Yes	☐ No
18. Would the proposed action impact areas having spedesignation or recognition such as prime or unique agricultural lands; coastal zones; designated wildern wilderness study areas; wild and scenic rivers; Nati Historic Landmarks (designated by the Secretary of Interior); 100-year floodplains; wetlands; sole source aquifers (potential sources of drinking water); Nation Wildlife Refuges; National Parks; areas of critical environmental concern; or other areas of high environmental sensitivity?	ness or onal f the	Yes	⊠ No

Environmentally sensitive resources include:

^{4.}b.(1)(c)(i) Proposed Federally listed, threatened, or endangered species or their designated critical habitats.

^{4.}b.(1)(c)(ii) Properties listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.

^{4.}b.(1)(c)(iii) Areas having special designation or recognition such as prime or unique agricultural lands; coastal zones; desig-nated wilderness or wilderness study areas; wild and scenic rivers; National Historic Landmarks (designated by the Secretary of the Interior); 100-year floodplains; wetlands; sole source aquifers (potential sources of drinking water); National Wildlife Refuges;

National Parks; areas of critical environmental concern; or other areas of high environmental sensitivity.

Conclusion

Based upon the information provided above, I conclude that this action qualifies for a documented categorical exclusion (CATEX) from the requirement to prepare an EA or an EIS, pursuant to the AFRH NEPA Regulations.

AFRH Master Planner or Project Manager

Date